

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 16, and 17 under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Michmerhuizen is respectfully requested. Michmerhuizen shows a device located in a vehicle for communicating between the vehicle and a number of applications exterior to the vehicle.

The claims herein have been amended to clarify that the structure of the invention is a combination of a remote entry device itself and a memory in the housing of the remote entry device that is accessible to the user. Michmerhuizen does not anticipate the invention as now claimed, at least for the reason that Michmerhuizen relates only to a system that is in the vehicle and not to a remote entry device. Thus, it is submitted that the claims distinguish over that disclosed in Michmerhuizen.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 35 is requested in light of its amendment to depend from claim 1.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 3-5, 12, and 13 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Michmerhuizen in view of Mackjust. As discussed above Michmerhuizen discloses a device that is located in a vehicle to allow various systems in the vehicle to communicate with diverse applications through a single transceiver. Applicant's claims, however, are directed to a remote entry system. The proposed combination would, therefore, not result in a remote entry device and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Michmerhuizen in view of the examiner's Official Notice for the reason that Michmerhuizen does not teach a remote entry device as claimed.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Michmerhuizen in view of Cheng. Michmerhuizen does not teach a remote entry device as claimed, and the proposed combination would not result in the claimed invention.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 10, 11, 14, and 15 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Michmerhuizen in view of Krishnamachari. As noted, Michmerhuizen does not teach a remote entry device as claimed. Thus, the proposed combination would not have resulted in the claimed invention. Moreover, it is submitted that there is nothing in Krishnamachari that would have given one of ordinary skill in the art any reason to provide a remote entry device with a memory having an owner's manual stored thereon. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn for all of these reasons.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 18, 20-23 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Mackjust in view of Kao and of claims 24-26 as unpatentable over Mackjust in view of Kao and Cheng, and of claims 27, 28 as unpatentable over Mackjust in view of Kao and Koh.


Mackjust teaches a device capable of operating as a remote entry device but fails to teach the basic combination of a remote entry device with an externally accessible memory configured to store data that is unrelated to the components or actions that are controlled by the remote entry device. Thus, Mackjust teaches at column 22, lines 15-27 the use of an external flash drive to provide a program to operate the controller. The flash drive is not a part of the controller but is external to it. This is in contrast to the invention wherein a flash drive or other memory element is within the housing of the remote entry device but accessible by the user to store information not related to the entry device. Thus, the proposed combination would not result in the invention as claimed.

The invention as claimed provides advantages not contemplated by the art of record. The invention is a combination in a single housing of a key-fob type remote entry device and a memory device that is accessible by a user and capable of storing data not related to the entry device. The invention is unique because it realizes that users virtually always have a key fob with them, and the combination of the invention ensures that that important electronic files are also always with them. Moreover, in one embodiment, the key fob can have the owner's manual on it whereby it is similarly never lost and can be updated by the user with the use of a home computer. Nothing in the art of record contains any suggestion of such combinations or provides any reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide them.

Accordingly, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any required fees to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,  
CLARK & BRODY



Conrad J. Clark  
Registration No. 30,340

**Customer No. 22902**  
1090 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 250  
Washington DC 20005  
Telephone: 202-835-1111  
Facsimile: 202-835-1755

Date: December 7, 2009